DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 121 UD 020 021

AUTHOR Cervenka, Edward J.; Cervenka, S. B.
TITLE Final Evaluation Report for the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School (At J.H.S. 45), 1977-1978, Funded Under an ESEA Title VII Grant.
INSTITUTION Community School District 4, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 1 Dec 78
GRANT G007503636
NOTE 59p.; Not available in paper copy due to reproduction quality of original document

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Bilingual Education; Junior High Schools; Mathematics; Multicultural Education; *Program Evaluation; Reading Programs; *Spanish Speaking; *Staff Improvement; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Bilingual Education Act 1968; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This evaluation focuses primarily on student achievement in a Title VII bilingual/bicultural education program at Junior High School 45 in New York City's East Harlem. The program, which served approximately 325 predominantly Hispanic students in 1977-78, is described in terms of its instructional components, student grouping, evaluation procedures, and staffing. Data are presented on student achievement in English reading, Spanish reading, mathematics performance in both languages for English and Spanish dominant students, and student attitudes (achievement motivation). In addition, a staff development component of the Title VII program is described and teachers' opinions presented. It is concluded that: (1) the seventh grade English dominant group failed to achieve all of its four performance objectives; (2) the seventh grade Spanish dominant group demonstrated a mixed pattern of achievement; (3) eighth grade English dominant students, as a group, achieved their performance objectives for all areas except math in English; (4) the eighth grade Spanish dominant group achieved all of its four objectives; and (5) though staff attitudes toward the program are generally positive, there is still a need for improving training in the areas of management skills and teacher attitudes. Appended to the report are copies of instruments used in the evaluation. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181121

DEC 0 - 1979

Copy !

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

for the

RAFAEL CORDERO BILINGUAL SCHOOL (AT J.H.S. 45)

1977 - 1978

Funded Under an ESEA Title VII Grant

New York City Community School District No. 4

District 4
Grant Award Number G007503636
Function Number 5039-87601
5039-87651

Prepared by

Edward J. Cervenka

and

S. B. Cervenka

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CD020021

December 1, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Ron Edmonds
New York City Public Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
	List of Tables	iii
I	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
II	EVALUATION DESIGN	4
III	EVALUATION FINDINGS	7
	Instructional Component	7
	English Reading Achievement	7
	Spanish Reading Achievement	11
	Math Achievement in English	13
	Math Achievement in Spanish	17
	Student Attitude (Achievement Motivation)	20
	Staff Development Component	23
IV	DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS	26
V	CONCLUSION	33
	Overall Appraisal	33
	Recommendations	37
	APPENDICES	39
A	Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students (English Version)	A
B	Percentile Norms for Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students (Achievement Motivation)	D
C	Procedures for Scoring Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students	E
D	Participant Evaluation of Staff Development and Training Activities (and Tabulated Data of Staff Opinion Questionnaire)	H
E	Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory (Sample Items)	J

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	English Reading Achievement, Seventh and Eighth Grade English Dominant Students	8
2	English Reading Achievement, Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students	10
3	Spanish Reading Achievement, Seventh and Eighth Grade English Dominant Students	12
4	Spanish Reading Achievement, Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students	14
5	Math Achievement in English, Seventh and Eighth Grade English Dominant Students	16
6	Math Achievement in English, Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students	18
7	Math Achievement in Spanish, Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students	19
8	Student Attitude (Achievement Motivation), Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students, June 1978 Administration	22

SECTION I: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Rafael Cordero Bilingual School is an ESEA Title VII bilingual-bicultural education program at Junior High School 45 in New York City's East Harlem. It also has been designated as a model program by Community School District 4 and the City of New York. In addition, the New York State Education Department has awarded the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School a Title IV-Part C demonstration grant, classifying it as a model bilingual education program throughout the State.

The program is a flexible one which takes into consideration the individual growth needs of each of its students. It also is an avenue where bilingual pupils coming from bilingual programs in the elementary schools can continue their education. The program proposal called for 250 pupils to be served during the 1977-78 school year. At the beginning of school, approximately 305 students were enrolled and by the end of the school year, some 325 were being served. A total of somewhat more than 325 students were served this year for varying periods of instruction, i.e., if students who were transferred during the year are included in the total.

The student population served by the school consisted of approximately 20% English dominant students and 80% Spanish dominant students. In addition to the students mandated to participate in a bilingual program by the Consent Decree between Aspira and the New York City Board of Education, children whose parents wish them to participate are also accepted. Most of the English dominant students are Puerto Rican or of other Hispanic origin and are Spanish-speaking to varying degrees. The school enrolls two somewhat distinct groups of "Spanish dominant" students. One is comprised of Spanish-speaking students who are clearly Spanish dominant in all language skills and in all domains of language use (home vs. school, academic study vs. social interaction, speaking-understanding vs. reading-writing, etc.). These students tend to be fairly recent arrivals from Spanish-speaking countries and areas. The second group is made up of students who are dominant in Spanish in <u>some</u> language skills and <u>some</u> domains of language use, and dominant in English in others. These students are mostly

natives of New York City or long time residents. Some of these students have had prior schooling principally in programs using English as the medium of instruction, though their home language had been Spanish. Most of these students were mandated to be in programs of bilingual instruction by the Aspira Consent Decree.

The Rafael Cordero Bilingual School's educational program is comprised of the following components: Instructional, Staff Development and Training (the BETTER Program). Curriculum Materials Development, Parent and Community Involvement (the PEP Program), and a Guidance component. The instructional component contains several specialized subcomponents such as the BETA Program (Bilingual Education Through the Arts), which emphasizes media and media-related training, and the I-CAN Program (Instruction in Career Awareness Now).

The instructional component is based on homogeneous grouping in the seventh and eighth grades. Students are placed in one of five groups by educational background and linguistic ability. Each subject area is programmed to meet during the same class period in the day. This meets the need to individualize programs for students, as well as create greater flexibility in the design of the program. Students are grouped on the basis of an initial period of testing and diagnostic evaluation by teachers and staff. During the year they are re-evaluated by the staff and regrouped as often as is educationally necessary.

The School is also organized into 10 official classes, which are heterogeneous in composition, providing for interaction between Spanish dominant and English dominant students. These groups serve as home room groups and also provide a context for instruction in secondary curriculum areas, e.g., art, music, recreation, guidance, and industrial and commercial arts.

The entire staff, teachers and paraprofessionals, participate in ongoing, comprehensive in-service training and staff development, as a part of the BETTER Personnel component. Each staff member also has the opportunity to conduct workshops for the other members of the staff. In addition to the weekly sessions, the teachers

participate in several weekend workshops aimed at developing skills in each of their subject area fields. They also matriculate in teacher-training programs at local universities. The overall goal of training and staff development is to enhance teacher and other instructional staff competencies, skills, understanding and attitudes so that staff can better achieve the goals and objectives of the instructional component.

The staff of the school during the 1977-78 academic year consisted of the following personnel: Program Director, Assistant Program Director, Teacher Trainer, Guidance Counselor, two Media Specialists, a Secretary, 19 bilingual teachers and 5 paraprofesionals. This year the Project Director, a Media Coordinator, a Guidance Counselor, 4 Bilingual Resource Teachers and 5 paraprofessionals (including a Community Liaison person) were supported under ESEA Title VII funding.

SECTION II. EVALUATION DESIGN

The proposed evaluation design, 1977-78, for the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School was included in this year's Application for Federal Assistance. This evaluation design was implemented according to specifications but with several revisions, which were described in the Interim Evaluation Report (pp. 1-4). These revisions are sumarized below:

1. English as a dominant language reading (Objectives 1 and 11) was evaluated by means of the Bond and Singer method (often called a "historical regression" procedure), in which each student is used as his or her own control.

2. English as a dominant language math (Objectives 2 and 12) was evaluated by means of the Bond and Singer method.

3. English as a dominant language reading for the seventh and eighth grades (Objectives 1 and 11 respectively) and English as a second language reading for the seventh and eighth grades (Objectives 8 and 18 respectively), will be evaluated by means of the Stanford Achievement Reading Tests, Forms A and B.

4. Staff development activities and the evaluation thereof using the Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory (Objective 21) will employ absolute, end-of-the-year performance criteria, established for the two principal groups in training, bilingual teachers and auxiliary personnel. These performance criteria will be based on the percentile norms for bilingual teachers developed during the last two evaluations of the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School. (This objective was subsequently modified during the course of this year's evaluation as noted in the text of Section III: Evaluation Findings.)

5. Oral-aural English and Spanish as second languages for the seventh and eighth grades (Objectives 3, 7, 13 and 17) were eliminated from the evaluation this year because of the quantity and quality of the test data available.

6. Two new objectives for Spanish as a second language reading were added this year for the seventh and eighth grades (new Objectives 3 and 13 respectively). Spanish as a second language reading was to be evaluated by means of the Bond and Singer analysis.

7. Student attitudes or Achievement Motivation (Objectives 4, 10, 14 and 20) were to be evaluated by means of descriptive statistics and percentile norms derived from last year's scores on the Bilingual Student Attitude Scale.

In summary, the performance of the educational program at the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School during the 1977-78 school year was to be evaluated by means of 20 evaluation performance objectives and their associated evaluative procedures. The instructional and staff development areas to be treated were as follows:

Instructional Objectives

Seventh Grade English Dominant

1. English reading
2. English math
3. Spanish as a Second Language Reading (new)
4. Student Attitude (Achievement Motivation)

Seventh Grade Spanish Dominant

5. Spanish reading
6. Spanish math
*7. Eliminated (Oral-aural ESL)
8. English as a second Language Reading
9. English math
10. Student Attitude (Achievement Motivation)

Eighth Grade English Dominant

11. English reading
12. English math
13. Spanish as a Second Language Reading (new)
14. Student Attitude (Achievement Motivation)

Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant

15. Spanish reading
16. Spanish math
*17. Eliminated (Oral-aural ESL)
18. English as a Second Language Reading
19. English math
20. Student Attitude (Achievement Motivation)

Staff Development and Training

21. Teacher attitudes
22. Staff evaluation of training

20 = Total Number of Objectives for 1977-78

In the following section of this report, Section III: Evaluation Findings, the results relating to the above objectives are reported. Immediately preceeding the reporting of findings, the applicable evaluation performance objectives are re-stated. The original proposed evaluation design should be consulted for full specification of evaluation procedures, instruments, etc. In Section III: Discussion of Findings, program achievements are discussed and interpreted at greater length, and findings pertaining to various grade and language groups are brought together. The final section of this report, SECTION V: CONCLUSION, gives an overall appraisal of program achievements during the 1977-78 school year and offers recommendations for improving program effective in the future.

SECTION III: EVALUATION FINDINGS

INSTRUCTIONAL COMPONENT

English Reading Achievement

Evaluation Objectives 1 and 11

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade English dominant students (Objective 1) and to eighth grade English dominant students (Objective 11) will result in improvement in English reading skills, as measured by the SAT reading test; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total reading score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 1 (page 8) gives the results of analyses of English reading achievement relating to Objectives 1 and 11. As is shown on Table 1 the seventh grade English dominant students did not achieve their performance objective for English reading; they obtained an actual posttest mean of 7.1 grade equivalents (G.E.), with a standard deviation (SD) of 1.72, and had an expected posttest mean of 7.9 G.E.'s (SD = 1.65). Thus, the group's actual posttest mean was significantly lower than the expected posttest mean, as indicated by the t-value of -2.600 and P of .017. This means, in other words, that the group's rate of reading growth declined significantly during the year. The group obtained a mean score of 6.7 G.E.'s, with SD = 1.62, when pretested in September 1977. The group's actual posttest mean was .4 G.E.'s higher than its pretest mean, but not significantly higher. In summary, the seventh grade English dominant students failed to demonstrate a significant improvement in reading growth grade and also failed to demonstration a significant improvement in mean scores (a weaker analysis of the data) during the year.

The eighth grade English dominant students achieved their stated performance objective for English reading, as shown on Table 1, lower half (page 8). They obtained an actual posttest mean of 8.9 G.E.'s

TABLE 1

ENGLISH READING ACHIEVEMENT

Seventh and Eighth Grade English Dominant Students

SAT, Grade Equivalent Scores

Total Score Analyses

ENGLISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest, SAT Reading Test Advanced Level, Form A	Posttest, SAT Reading Test Advanced Level, Form B	
		Pretest	Actual Posttest	Expected Posttest
7th Grade (Objective 1)	N	23	23	23
	M	6.7	7.1	7.9
	SD	1.62	1.72	1.65
	t	.661	-2.600	
	P	.516	.017	(Not Met)
8th Grade (Objective 11)	N	17	17	17
	M	7.9	8.9	8.1
	SD	1.87	2.09	2.4
	t	4.282	2.334	
	P	< .001	.034	(Met)

(SD = 2.09) and an expected posttest mean of 8.1 G.E.'s (SD = 2.4), with t = 2.334 and P = .034. This finding strongly suggests that the group made a significant improvement in reading growth rate as a result of instruction in the program and that it would not have done so in the absence of the program.

Evaluation Objectives 8 and 18

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 8) and to eighth grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 18) will result in improvement in English as a second language reading skills, as measured by the SAT Reaing test; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total reading score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 2 gives the results of analyses of English as a second language reading achievement relating to Objectives 8 and 18. The seventh grade Spanish dominant students failed to achieve their performance objective for English as a second language reading. However, their actual posttest mean was significantly higher than their pretest mean (a weaker analysis of the data). The group had a pretest mean of 4.3 (SD = 1.22) and an actual posttest mean of 5.0 (SD = 1.35), with t = 4.282 and $P < .001$. Thus the group made a significant improvement in second language reading skills but such an improvement may or may not have been a result of instruction in the program. (See Table 2, page 10.)

The eighth grade Spanish dominant students achieved their performance objective for English as a second language reading. The group obtained an actual posttest mean of 6.2 (SD = 2.11) and had an expected posttest mean of 5.5 (SD = 1.75), with t = 3.969 and $P < .001$. Thus this group made a significant improvement in reading growth rate which probably would not have been achieved in the absence of the program. It is to be noted that the group began the year reading 2.9 G.E.'s below native-speaker norms and finished the year 2.7 G.E.'s below these norms (See Table 2, lower half, page 10).

TABLE 2

ENGLISH READING ACHIEVEMENT

Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students

SAT, Grade Equivalent Scores

Total Score Analyses

SPANISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest, SAT Reading Test Advanced Level, Form A	Posttest, SAT Reading Test Advanced Level, Form B	
		Pretest	Actual Posttest	Expected Posttest
7th Grade (Objective 8)	N	80	80	80
	M	4.3	5.0	4.8
	SD	1.22	1.35	1.43
	t	4.282	1.057	
	P	< .001	.294	(Not Met)
8th Grade (Objective 18)	N	79	79	79
	M	5.1	6.2	5.5
	SD	1.63	2.11	1.75
	t	4.680	3.969	
	P	< .001	< .001	(Met)

Spanish Reading Achievement

Objectives 3 and 13

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade English dominant students (Objective 3) and to eighth grade English dominant students (Objective 13) will result in improvement in Spanish reading skills, as measured by the IAS Prueba de Lectura, Level III; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total reading score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 3 (page 12) provides analyses of Spanish reading as it relates to Objectives 3 and 13. The seventh grade English dominant students failed to achieve their stated performance objective for Spanish reading. Further, the group's mean score actual declined .4 G.E.'s between pretesting and actual posttesting. The group obtained a pretest mean of 4.7 (SD = 1.33) and an actual posttest mean of 4.3 (SD = 1.83). In fairness it is to be noted that this objective is a new one which the evaluators had introduced into the evaluation design this year.

Table 3, lower half (page 12) provides analyses of Spanish reading as it relates to Objective 13, to the eighth grade English dominant students. This group achieved their stated performance objective for Spanish reading. The group obtained an actual posttest mean of 6.6 (SD = 1.62), as compared to an expected posttest mean of 5.3 (SD = 2.19), with $t = 2.324$ and $P < .001$. This outcome therefore strongly suggests that the eighth grade English dominant students made a significant improvement in reading growth rate in Spanish which would not have been made in the absence of the program.

Objectives 5 and 15

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 5) and to eighth grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 15) will result in improvement in Spanish read-

TABLE 3

SPANISH READING ACHIEVEMENT

Seventh and Eighth Grade English Dominant Students

Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura

Grade Equivalent Scores, Total Score Analyses

ENGLISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest, IAS Prueba de Lectura Level 3, Form CEs	Posttest, IAS Prueba de Lectura Level 3, Form DEs	
		Pretest	Actual Posttest	Expected Posttest
7th Grade (Objective 3)	N	17	17	17
	M	4.7	4.3	5.3
	SD	1.33	1.83	1.55
	t	.966	2.328	
	P	.349	.034 (Not Met)	
8th Grade (Objective 13)	N	14	14	14
	M	4.3	6.6	5.3
	SD	1.67	1.62	2.19
	t	4.642	2.324	
	P	< .001	< .001 (Met)	

ing skills, as measured by the IAS Prueba de Lectura, Level III; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total reading score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 4 (page 14) provides analyses of Spanish reading as it relates to Objectives 5 and 15. The seventh grade Spanish dominant students failed to achieve their stated performance objective for Spanish reading. The group did not demonstrate a significant improvement in reading growth rate. However, the group made a significant improvement in Spanish reading during the year; they obtained a pretest mean of 4.3 (SD = 1.21) and an actual posttest mean of 4.9 (SD = 1.32), with $t = 4.451$ and $P < .001$. This analysis, it will be recalled, is a weaker demonstration of student achievement in the program. Students' progress in Spanish reading may or may not have been due to instruction in the program.

Table 4, bottom half (page 14) gives analyses of Spanish reading as it relates to Objective 15, the eighth grade Spanish dominant students. This group did achieve their stated performance objective for Spanish reading. The group obtained an actual posttest mean of 6.2 (SD = 2.56), as compared to an expected posttest mean of 5.1 (SD = 2.50), with $t = 3.841$ and $P < .001$. This finding suggests that the group made a significant improvement in Spanish reading growth rate which would not have been made in absence of the program. The group was reading at pretesting 3.8 G.E.'s below Puerto Rican norms, and at actual posttesting, 2.7 G.E.'s below these norms; thus the group progressed two full G.E. levels during the year.

Math Achievement in English

Evaluation Objectives 2 and 12

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade English dominant students (Objective 2) and to eighth grade English dominant students (Objective 12) will result in improvement in math skills, as measured by the SAT Math Test, Advanced Level; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain

TABLE 4

SPANISH READING ACHIEVEMENT

Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students

Inter-American Series, Prueba de Lectura

Grade Equivalent Scores, Total Score Analyses

SPANISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest, IAS Prueba de Lectura Level 3, Form CEs	Posttest, IAS Prueba de Lectura Level 3, Form DEs	
		Pretest	Actual Posttest	Expected Posttest
	N	77	77	77
	M	4.3	4.9	4.8
7th Grade	SD	1.21	1.32	1.37
(Objective 5)	t	4.451	.529	
	P	< .001	.595 (Not Met)	
	N	63	63	63
	M	4.2	6.2	5.1
8th Grade	SD	2.09	2.56	2.50
(Objective 15)	t	7.076	3.841	
	P	< .001	< .001 (Met)	

in total math score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 5 (page 16) gives the analyses of math achievement in English relating to Objectives 2 and 12. The seventh grade English dominant students did not achieve their performance objective for math in English. They did not demonstrate a significant improvement in math skills growth rate. They did however made a significant improvement in math skills during the year. The group had a pretest mean of 5.5 (SD = 1.23) as compared to an actual posttest mean of 6.4 (SD = 1.12), with t = 3.965 and P = .001. This latter analysis does not establish that such progress was achieved as a result of instruction in the program.

Table 5, lower half (page 16) provides the analyses of math achievement in English relating to Objective 12, for eighth grade English dominant students. Two Bond and Singer analyses were performed on math achievement data: the first analysis covers the 1977-78 school and the second analysis covers the two school years 1976-1978, i.e., the School's entire instructional cycle or program. This latter analysis is indicated on Table 5 in parenthesis. In the first analysis, the eighth grade English dominant students obtained an actual posttest mean of 8.7 (SD = 1.47) as compared with an expected posttest mean of 8.5 (SD = 1.46), with t = .930 and P = .361. In the second, the group obtained a pretest mean of 8.7 (SD = 1.73) as compared to an expected posttest mean of 8.9 (SD =1.69), with t = 1.106 and P = .279. Thus, by either analysis the group failed to achieve its performance objective. The group did however demonstrate a significant improvement in math skills during the year, obtaining a pretest mean of 7.9 (SD = 1.48) as compared with an actual posttest mean of 8.7 (SD = 1.47), with t = 4.860 and P = <.001. It would appear that this group found it difficult to demonstrate a significant improvement in math skills growth because it began the year performing at a fairly high level, i.e., only .1 G.E. below the norm.

TABLE 5

MATH ACHIEVEMENT IN ENGLISH

Seventh and Eighth Grade English Dominant Students

SAT, Grade Equivalent Scores

Total Score Analyses

ENGLISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest, SAT Math Test Advanced Level, Form A Pretest		Posttest, SAT Math Test Advanced Level, Form B Actual Posttest		Expected Posttest
	N	25		25		25
	M	5.5		6.4		6.2
7th Grade	SD	1.23		1.12		1.39
(Objective 2)	t		3.965		.442	
	P		.001		.662	(Not Met)
	N	27		27 (27)*		27 (27)
	M	7.9		8.7 (8.7)		8.5 (8.9)
8th Grade	SD	1.48		1.47 (1.73)		1.46 (1.69)
(Objective 12)	t		4.860		.930 (1.106)	
	P		< .001		.361 (.279)	(Not Met) (Not Met)

*Alternate analysis in parenthesis for the 8th grade is a Bond and Singer analysis of two years of math achievement in the program.

Evaluation Objectives 9 and 19

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 9) and to eighth grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 19) will result in improvement in math skills in English, as measured by the SAT Math Test, Advanced Level; such improvement demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total math score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest to posttest mean gains during the year with average gains of previous years, computed from pretest scores.

Findings

Table 6 (page 18) reports analyses of math achievement in English relating to Objective 9 and 19. The seventh grade Spanish dominant students failed to achieve their evaluation performance objective for math in English. However, the group did demonstrate a significant improvement in math during the year, obtaining a pretest mean of 4.2 (SD = 1.09) as compared with an actual posttest mean of 4.8 (SD = 1.1.), with $t = 4.096$ and $P < .001$.

Math achievement in English of the eighth grade Spanish dominant students was analyzed by two Bond and Singer analyses, one covering the 1977-78 school year and the second encompassing students' two full years in the program. The latter analysis is indicated on Table 6 by parenthesis. By this latter analysis the group achieved its performance objective.

Math Achievement in Spanish

Evaluation Objectives 6 and 16

Instruction provided by the program to seventh grade Spanish dominant students (Objective 6) and to eighth grade Spanish dominant students (Objectives 16) will result in improvement in math skills in Spanish, as measured by the Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas; such improvement being demonstrated by a statistically significant ($P \leq .05$) mean gain in total math score, as indicated by a comparison of pretest and posttest scores.

Note: This analysis could not be carried out because there were insufficient pretest scores for the 1977-78 school year.

TABLE 6

MATH ACHIEVEMENT IN ENGLISH

Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students

SAT, Grade Equivalent Scores

Total Score Analyses

SPANISH-DOMINANT STUDENTS		Pretest, SAT Math Test Advanced Level, Form A	Posttest, SAT Math Test Advanced Level, Form B	
		Pretest	Actual Posttest	Expected Posttest
7th Grade (Objective 9)	N	49	49	49
	M	4.2	4.8	4.6
	SD	1.09	1.10	1.26
	t	4.096	.525	
	P	< .001	.602	(Not Met)
8th Grade (Objective 19)	N	67	67 (63)*	67 (63)
	M	5.0	5.6 (5.7)	5.4 (5.4)
	SD	1.11	1.22 (1.58)	1.22 (1.23)
	t	3.984	1.101 (1.978)	
	P	< .001	.275 (.052)	(Not Met) (Met)

*Alternate analysis in parenthesis for the 8th grade is a Bond and Singer analysis of two years of math achievement in the program.

TABLE 7

MATH ACHIEVEMENT IN SPANISH

Seventh and Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students

Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas

Raw Scores, Total Score Analyses

		1976-77 Posttest	1977-78 Posttest
SPANISH-DOMIANT 7th Grade (Objective 6)	N	16	25
	M	24.3	22.4
	SD	8.9	7.0
	$t_{(i)}$	.742	
	P	.462 (Not Met)	
SPANISH-DOMINANT 8th Grade (Objective 16)	N	6	39
	M	31.8	29.4
	SD	7.88	8.34
	$t_{(i)}$	.667	
	P	.508 (Not Met)	

As an alternative, the evaluators chose to compare 1977 posttest scores and 1978 posttest scores on the Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas, using an independent t-test.

Findings

As shown in Table 7 (above), neither group achieved its performance objective in math in Spanish.

Student Attitude (Achievement Motivation)

Evaluation Objectives 4, 10, 14 and 20

Instruction provided in the I-CAN (Instruction in Career Awareness Now) and the BETA (Bilingual Education Through the Arts) programs, and the bilingual education program generally of the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School, will result in "postive student attitudes" after one year of participation and "strongly postive student attitudes" after two years of participation, as determined by end-of-the year scores on the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students (English and Spanish versions; see Appendix A for English version).

Since this experimental instrument and its interpretative uses are still undergoing development, it was not feasible to select precise or rigorous performance criteria which could be applied to the set of four objectives given above. Therefore, student attitudes or achievement motivation -- which is the central construct underlying this instrument -- were to be evaluated by means of descriptive statistics and by means of the percentile norms derived from the performance of 215 seventh and eighth grade students in the program last year (See Appendix B for Percentile Norms).

In order to construct percentile norms for the instrument, a scoring system had to be devised for the 24 four-choice items and the one open-ended occupational question (See Appendix C for information on scoring procedures). Values for the alternatives on the scale varied from 4 to 0, or from 3 to 0, or from 2 to 0, or from 1 to 0. Values for alternatives on each individual scale were assigned more or less systematically on the basis of an extensive item analysis of the original norming sample (See Final Evaluation Report 1976-77, pp. 19-22). In order to neutralize linguistic and cultural difference in responding on such a scale (and also so that a single scoring system could be fairly applied to all groups in the program), it was necessary to use various score ranges for individual items, e.g., if on the basis of item analysis and expert judgment, an item on the scale appears to favor one group and disfavors the others, its effect on total score was neutralized or minimized by assigning all alternatives on that particular scale either 1 or 0. The last, open-ended occupational question on the scale was scored from 5 to 0,

utilizing a ranking of occupations (See Appendix C).

Findings

In June 1978 during the last weeks of school, the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students was administered to 89 students at the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School. Most of those tested were seventh graders since the eighth graders were officially graduated and were under little obligation to attend school during this period. Each group of students tested were given the Scale in their dominant language or stronger language -- generally this was left to teacher judgment. Table 8 (page 22) provides descriptive statistics on student response on the instrument by grade and language dominance group. In addition, statistics for the Spanish dominant seventh and eighth grades have been broken down into two sub-groups: students who are dominant in Spanish in all domains of language use (recent arrivals) and students who appear to be English dominant in some domains of language use. The latter group is made up primarily of "Aspira" student, who are generally long term residents of the New York City area and who have had considerable exposure to instruction in English during previous years of schooling, but whose home language generally remains Spanish or Spanish and English.

As shown in Table 8, the three 7th grade groups made almost the same mean scores on the Scale at the end of the year; moreoever, the variability of their scores (as indicated by standard deviations) was approximately the same magnitude. Assuming validity for the scale, this finding would strongly suggest that the program was highly successful in affecting students' achievement motivations, equally and in all significant program groups. In terms of the percentile norms for the Scale, the two Spanish-speaking groups performed only slightly below or above their appropriate norms, viz., Spanish Dominant — S-Norms - 48%ile; Mixed Dominance — M-Norm = 53%ile. The English dominant group obtained a total mean score on the scale which fell at the 35%ile, suggesting perhaps a lowered level of achievement motivation.

As is indicated in Table 8, the small samples of eighth graders from the three groups scored somewhat higher than the seventh graders.

TABLE 8
STUDENT ATTITUDE (ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION)
Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students
June 1978 Administration

	English Dominant	Spanish Dominant	Mixed Dominance
SEVENTH GRADE	N = 17 M = 55.3 SD = 8.3	N = 22 M = 56.5 SD = 7.0	N = 39 M = 55.6 SD = 6.9
Interpretation of Seventh Grade Group Means			
	E-Norms[1] = 35%ile S-Norms = 33%ile M-Norms = 46%ile	E-Norms = 42%ile S-Norms = 48%ile M-Norms = 59%ile	E-Norms = 39%ile S-Norms = 35%ile M-Norms = 52%ile
	English Dominant	**Spanish Dominant**	**Mixed Dominance**
EIGHTH GRADE	N = 3 M = 68.0 SD = 4.7	N = 2 M = 58.5 SD = 2.1	N = 6 M = 57.7 SD = 9.6
Interpretation of Eighth Grade Group Means			
	E-Norms[1] = 88%ile S-Norms = 96%ile M-Norms = 98%ile	E-Norms = 55%ile S-Norms = 60%ile M-Norms = 71%ile	E-Norms = 47%ile S-Norms = 56%ile M-Norms = 62%ile

[1]The three sets of norms for the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students are given in Appendix B. English Dominant (E-Norms) are based on the administration of the English version of the Scale to English dominant students in the seventh and eighth grades in June 1977. Spanish Dominant (S-Norms) are based on the administration of the Spanish version to Spanish dominant seventh and eighth graders in June 1977. Mixed-Dominance Norms (M-Norms) are based on the administration of the English or Spanish versions of the Scale to seventh and eighth grade students of "mixed" language dominance, generally this group included "Aspira" students, also in June 1977. This latter group is labled "mixed dominant" because it can function more effectively in English in some domains of language use and in Spanish in others. Even though the Scale was presented to students orally as well as by written materials, most students in this "mixed dominant" group tookthe English version of it.

Looking at their mean scores in terms of the percentile norms for the Scale, their achievement motivation appears to be quite high. These scores tend to confirm that the eighth grade students who took the Scale were a select, and probably highly motivated group. They attended school during the final weeks of the term when they had no strong obligation to do so. Therefore, they were probably not representative of the eighth grade students this year as a whole.

In summary, all groups in the program appeared to demonstrate high and uniform achievement motivation, viz., attitudes toward school, education, work and future careers. The Spanish-speaking groups showed more positive attitudes, and the English-speaking group, less positive ones in terms of the norms for the Scale. A small and undoubtedly unrepresentative sample of eighth grade students showed strongly postive attitudes and strong achievement motivation.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT COMPONENT

Teacher Attitudes: Objective 21

Training and other staff development activities provided to teachers and staff by the program during the 1977-78 school year will result in the improvement of their "professional" attitudes, i.e., attitudes toward teacher-student relationships, language and bilingualism, culture and pluri-culturalism, theory and methods of bilingual education and teacher-parent-school-community relationships, as measured by the Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory (BTAI). (See Appendix E). The performance objective for Teacher Attitudes is that 65% of all program bilingual teachers score at or above the 50%ile for the instrument, both on total score and on the five subscales.

Findings

This evaluation procedure was not carried out, by mutual agreement of the evaluators and the Project Director. This decision was taken because the teachers in the program had taken the one form of the BTAI several times; it could not be productively used again. Instead the BTAI was administered before the 1978-79 school year and the occasion was used as a training session dealing with attitudes.

Staff Evaluation of Training: Objective 22

Staff development and training activities provided by the school will by the end of the school year result in a positive opinion on the part of the instructional staff, as determined by end-of-the-year questionnaire survey (See Appendix D). Positive opinion was to be defined as a substantial majority of the staff responding (67% or more) expressing a positive evaluation on specific rating scales pertaining to all major staff development and training activities.

Findings

The tabulated data for the staff opinion questionnaire used for this objective are presented in full in Appendix D.

Fourteen of the nineteen bilingual teachers on the program staff returned completed questionnaires on training. Five of the fourteen teachers indicated that they had participated in summer 1977 training activities provided under ESEA Title VII in preparation for instruction this school year. The days of their participation varied greatly, from 1 to 2 days to "more than four weeks" (Appendix D, Question 2). All the teachers who engaged in such training rated it positively: 60% rated it "very useful" and 40% rated it "quite useful" (Question 3).

Four of the fourteen teachers reported that they participated in pre-service staff development and training activities provided under ESEA Title VII, generally for 3 to 5 days (Question 4). They found this pre-service training to be "very useful" (60%) and "quite useful" (40%) (Question 5).

Thirteen of the fourteen teachers reported that they participated in scheduled in-service training and staff development activities or sessions provided under ESEA Title VII (excluding special workshops) during the year (Question 6). Seventy-nine percent rated this training to be positive, from "moderately useful," to "quite useful," to "very useful" (Question 7).

Eight of the fourteen teachers indicated they took university courses during the year which were funded under ESEA Title VII (Q. 8). These eight teachers took a total of 14 courses; 38% of them found courses to be "very relevant" and 50% "quite relevant"(Question 9).

Thirteen teachers reported they participated in special workshops (weekend and other) during the school year; together they attended a total of 20 different workshops and conferences (Q. 10). These participants rated these workshops as making a "substantial contribution" to their job performance and professional development (Question 11). Ninety-two percent of them found that the special workshops were "very effectively" or "quite effectively" implemented in terms of organization, scheduling, administration (Question 12). The great majority of the participants in these workshops found they provided them useful information, materials, etc. for their work (Question 13).

The teachers were asked to rate the treatment of various areas of professional preparation by the program, basing such ratings on all staff development and training activities provided under ESEA Title VII during the year. Teachers as a group rated all 16 areas of professional development as "satisfactory" or "good" (Question 14). Teachers were also asked to indicate their own needs for staff development and training for the 1978-79 school year. The professional areas most frequently indentified were: "personal qualities leading to successful teaching in bilingual education programs," "supervision of . . . own teaching ...," "types and methodology of staff development employed by School," "school-community relations and parent involvement," "curriculum development, adaptation and utilization," and "student assessment, including preparation of behavioral objectives" (Question 15). In terms of subject areas of instruction, the group felt moderate need for professional preparation in "math," "I-CAN program," "BETA program," "social studies," "science" and "Spanish as a second language" (Question 16).

Most teachers generally felt that "ample training opportunities" were offered during the year and with "good results." Several teachers suggested one or two more workshops in math, science and social studies. Recommendations for improving training included "making time available for weekly staff conferences," "more specific guidelines for teaching specific subject areas," "more direction in curriculum organization," "more individual contact with teacher trainer," and "more supervision and feedback."

SECTION IV: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This section brings together all evaluation findings relating to each grade and language dominant group, and also to staff development and training, and discusses and further interprets these findings. SECTION V: CONCLUSION, which follows this discussion, gives an overall appraisal of the bilingual education program at the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School during the 1977-78 and offers recommendations and suggestions for strengthening program management and instruction, as well as for increasing student achievement.

Seventh Grade English Dominant Students

This group failed to achieve any of its four performance objectives in a decisive or clear manner. The group did not demonstrate a significant improvement in English reading growth rate (Objective 1), in terms of the Bond and Singer method, during the year; in fact, the group experienced a significant decline in reading growth rate. The group also did not show a significant improvement in mean scores during the year, as analysed by a pretest-posttest method. The group obtained a pretest mean of 6.7 G.E.'s (SD = 1.62) and a posttest mean of 7.1 G.E.'s (SD = 1.72). Thus the group was .3 G.E.'s below national norms for English reading at pretesting and .8 G.E.'s below these norms at posttesting.

The group also did not demonstrate a significant improvement in math skills acquisition rate in English (Objective 2) during the year. However, they did show a significant improvement in math skills means during the year in terms of a pretest-posttest analysis. Such an improvement may or may not be due to the School's instructional program. This alternate analysis has little potential for identifying the cause of educational improvements. The group obtained a pretest mean in English math of 5.5 (SD = 1.73) and a posttest mean of 6.4 (SD = 1.12). Thus the group was performing 1.5 G.E.'s below national norms both at beginning and end of the school year.

The group failed to make a significant improvement in Spanish as a second language reading growth rate (Objective 3) or even to

make a significant improvement in means during the year. The group had a pretest mean of 4.7 (SD = 1.33) and a posttest mean of 4.3 (SD = 1.83), thus the group's mean scores declined slightly. At the beginning of the year the year, the group was 2.7 G.E.'s below Puerto Rican norms for Spanish reading and at the end, 3.6 G.E.'s below these norms.

The group fared rather poorly in terms of student attitude or achievement motivation (Objective 4). Seventeen English dominant seventh graders obtained a raw score mean of 55.3 (SD = 8.3), of a maximum possible score of 76, at the end of the year. The group's mean score was, however, only at the 35%ile of their norming group (E-Norms, See Appendix B). This was by far the lowest percentile score made by any of the four groups in the program. This 35%ile indicates that 65% of the students in the norming group are scoring higher on the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students than this group. Since the norming group consisted of last year's seventh and eighth grade English dominant students -- an appropriate comparison group -- this group clearly appears to have poor attitudes toward school and low achievement motivation.

Seventh Grade Spanish Dominant Students

This group demonstrated a positive pattern of achievement for some of its objectives. The group failed to achieve its performance objective in Spanish reading (Objective 5), i.e. by demonstrating a significant improvement in reading growth rate by the Bond and Singer method. It did however make a significant improvement in Spanish reading during the year, as determined by a pretest-posttest analysis. This improvement may or may not be due to the instruction of the program. The group obtained a pretest mean of 4.3 (SD = 1.21) and a posttest mean of 4.9 (SD = 1.32), indicating that the group was 2.7 G.E.'s below Puerto Rican reading norms at pretesting and 3.0 G.E.'s below these norms at posttesting.

The group failed to demonstrate a significant improvement in Spanish math (Objective 6); however, the evaluation procedure used here was weak and somewhat inappropriate; it should probably be discarded. The group's 1978 posttest raw score mean of 22.4

(SD = 7.0) was at the 15%ile of urban Puerto Rican norms and at the 20%ile for rural Puerto Rican norms. There seems little question that the Spanish dominant seventh grade students did poorly in Spanish math during the 1977-78 school year.

The group failed to demonstrate a significant improvement in English as a second language reading growth rate (Objective 8) during the year. It did however made a significant improvement in ESL reading during the year. The group had a pretest mean of 4.3 (SD = 1.22) and a posttest mean of 5.0 (SD = 1.35), respectively 2.7 G.E.'s and 2.9 G.E.'s below national norms for native English speakers.

The group also did not make a significant improvement in rate of English math skills acquisition (Objective 9) but did make a significant improvement in mean score when compared pre and post. The group obtained a pretest mean of 4.2 (SD = 1.09) and a posttest mean of 4.8 (SD = 1.10), respectively 2.8 G.E.'s and 3.1. G.E.'s below national norms for native English speakers.

The Spanish dominant seventh grade students clearly achieved their performance objective for student attitude or achievement motivation (Objective 10). Twenty-two Spanish dominant seventh graders obtained a raw score mean on the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students of 56.5 (SD = 7.0), out of maximum possible score of 76. This raw mean score for the group was at the 48%ile of the appropriate norming group (S-Norms, see Appendix B). The second group of Spanish dominant students, heretofore described as being of "mixed" dominance and generally made up of "Aspira" students, performed slightly better on the Scale; 39 students made a raw mean score of 55.6 (SD = 6.9), which was at the 52%ile of their appropriate norming group (M-Norms, see Appendix B).

Eighth Grade English Dominant Students

This group achieved its performance objectives for English as a dominant language reading (Objective 11), Spanish as a second language reading (Objective 13) and Student Attitude or Achievement motivation (Objective 14). It failed to achieve its objective for math in English (Objective 12).

The group obtained a pretest mean score of 7.9 (SD = 1.87) as compared with a posttest of 8.9 (SD = 2.09). Thus the group was reading in English .1 G.E.'s below national norms at pretesting and it was on grade level at posttesting.

The group failed, on both of the Bond and Singer analyses carried out, to demonstrate a significant improvement in math skills acquisition rate. However the group performed at such a high level in math, both at the beginning of this school year and when they began the program two years ago, that it would have been difficult for them to show a significant increase in math skills acquisition rate. The group did make a significant improvement in mean scores in English math during the year, with the analysis resulting in a large t-value and an .8 G.E.'s increment in mean score. The group obtained a pretest mean score of 7.9 (SD = 1.48) and a posttest mean of 8.7 (1.47), which were respectively only .1 G.E.'s and .2 G.E.'s below national math norms. Looking at the group's absolute performance in math skills at the end of the year, their achievement must finally be regarded as highly satisfactory. The group will most likely do very well in math in subsequent schooling.

The group obtained a pretest mean score in Spanish reading of 4.3 (SD = 1.67) and a posttest mean of 6.6 (SD = 1.62), which were respectively 3.7 G.E.'s and 2.3 G.E.'s below Puerto Rican reading norms in Spanish.

A small group of English dominant eighth graders made a mean raw score of 68.0 (SD = 4.7), out of a maximum possible score of 76, on the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students. This raw score mean was at the 88%ile of the appropriate norming group (i.e., E-Norms, see Appendix B). However, it appears unlikely that this small group was representative of all English dominant eighth graders in the School.

Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students

This group achieved all of its principal performance objectives: Spanish reading (Objective 15), English as a second language reading (Objective 18), English as a second language math (Objective 19) and student attitude or achievement motivation (Objective 20).

Because of insufficient pretest scores, the performance objective for math in Spanish (Objective 16) could not be carried out. A post hoc analysis was made of 1977 posttest and 1978 posttest scores, utilizing a t(i) comparison; however, a significant improvement in math in Spanish was not found. As noted previously, this analysis should be discarded. End of the year raw mean score for Spanish math was 29.4 (SD = 8.34), which was at the 40%ile of Puerto Rican urban norms and at the 45%ile of such norms for rural areas. These end of the year percentile scores strongly suggest that the group was performing quite satisfactorily in math in Spanish. Should members of this group return to Puerto Rico to live, they would probably have little difficulty coping with math instruction in Spanish.

The group obtained a pretest mean score of 4.2 (SD = 2.09) in Spanish reading, as compared with a posttest mean of 6.2 (SD = 2.56). The group was thus 3.8 G.E.'s below Puerto Rican norms for Spanish reading at the beginning of the year and 2.7 G.E.'s below these norms at the end of the year. Members of this group would probably have somewhat more difficulty coping with reading instruction in Spanish should they return to Puerto Rico, but probably not any more difficulty than they have with reading instruction in English (see below).

The group obtained a pretest mean of 5.1 (SD = 1.63) in English as a second language reading, as compared with a posttest mean of 6.2 (SD = 2.11), which were respectively 2.9 G.E.'s and 2.7 G.E.'s below national norms in English reading for native speakers.

The group made a pretest mean of 5.0 (SD = 1.11) in English as a second language math and a posttest mean of 5.7 (SD = 1.58); their mean scores were respectively 3.0 G.E.'s and 3.2 G.E.'s below national norms for math in English.

Two small samples of Spanish dominant eighth grade students took the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students at the end of the year: one sample of Spanish dominant students and one of Spanish-speaking students with "mixed" English-Spanish dominance. The first subgroup obtained a raw score mean of 58.5 (SD = 2.1), which

was at the 60%ile of their appropriate norming group (S-Norms, see Appendix B). The second group had a raw score mean of 57.7 (SD = 9.6), which was at the 62%ile of their appropriate norming group (M-Norms, see Appendix B). The two samples are probably adequately representative of the Spanish dominant eighth graders of the School.

Staff Development

End-of-the-year measurement of attitudes (Objective 21) with the Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory was not carried out this year because this instrument has probably been used too often with the teachers and staff of the School for results to be useful and meaningful. It was decided that the BTAI would be given just before the start of the 1978-79 school year and that the occasion would be used as a training session dealing with teacher attitudes, particularly those covered by the BTAI. This has been carried out by the evaluators and they hope to continue to conduct training sessions dealing with teacher attitudes in the future.

Over the years that the BTAI has been used at the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School, the evaluators have observed little change in teacher's fundamental attitudes -- as measured by the BTAI. These include attitudes toward teacher-student relationships, language and linguistic variation, "culture" in the anthropological sense and pluriculturalism, the theory and practice of bilingual-bicultural education, and parent-teacher-school-community relations. Program teacher performance on the BTAI has consistently been low, in terms of the norms provided for the BTAI, which are local district norms for bilingual teachers, which the evaluators believe to be highly appropriate.

It would appear that the School's very extensive and varied training and staff development activities could include additional training which would affect the professional attitudes of teachers and other staff toward students, what they are teaching, and what they are doing generally in the School.

Fourteen of the 19 teachers assigned to the School evaluated the staff development and training activities (Objective 22)

provided for under ESEA Title VII funding. The teachers who participated in the various training and staff development activities provided under ESEA Title VII generally regarded then in a very positive manner. These activities included summer training activities, pre-service training, in-service training, university coursework, and special workshops and conferences. There is no question that the program provided this year a great abundance of training and staff development activites, which were effective in enhancing the professionalism, competence, knowledge and skills of teachers and other staff and in improving their performance on the job.

The teachers rated the impact of all training and staff developmen activities on 16 areas of professional preparation and they found that the program had treated all 16 areas in training either "satisfactorily" or "good." The teachers also identified the "need" areas of professional preparation and development, as well as the various subject areas of the School's curriculum. Overall, teachers' ratings and comments showed that the program's training processes were highly effective and there remained little room for improvement. The evaluators are convinced that training has been comprehensive and effective but there is considerable room for improving training, e.g., in the areas of teacher attitudes and management skills for both staff and teachers.

SECTION V: CONCLUSION

Overall Appraisal

The overall appraisal of the bilingual education program at the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School can perhaps best be organized by treating first the firmest and generally the most positive conclusions reached by this evaluation study of the program and then proceed to the least firm conclusions. This appraisal takes into account not only technical matters of evaluation (design, instrumentation, testing and measurement, statistics, data analysis and interpretation) but also evaluator judgment, for in the final analysis, technical and statistical findings must be translated into educational findings and also into ordinary language, which requires human judgment and interpretation.

Twelve of the 20 objectives treated in this evaluation study were assessed by the Bond and Singer Method or "historical regression" procedure. These 12 analyses therefore provide the firmest conclusions about the program, since they make use of each student as his or her own "control group" and also permit an evaluator to make judgments about actual program effects, i.e., determine if the educational effects measured or observed of students could have occured in the absence of the program or if they were in fact probably due to the program.

With this background, the evaluators have found that significant improvements in academic growth <u>rates</u> were made by students during the 1977-78 school year and such improvements probably would not have been made had there been no bilingual education program, in the following groups/subject areas:

Eighth Grade English Dominant Students

- English as a dominant language reading
- Spanish as a second language reading

Eighth Grade Spanish Dominant Students

- Spanish as a dominant language reading
- English as a second language reading
- English as a second language math

Concerning these five academic areas and groups, program and district administrators can be confident that these improvements represent genuine educational improvements and that they are probably due to program staff efforts.

The evaluators found that significant improvements in academic growth rates were not made by students, nor were any significant improvements in mean scores (as determined by pretest-posttest analyses) during the year, in the following groups/subject areas:

Seventh Grade English Dominant Students

English as a dominant language reading
Spanish as a second language reading

With respect to the above two academic areas, one can be quite confident that these instances of no improvement represent serious educational failures, by the program, by the students or by virtue of other factors.

In the remaining instances of the Bond and Singer analyses, there occured no significant improvement in academic growth rates during the year but students did demonstrate significant improvements in mean scores when assessed by pretest-posttest analyses. The negative finding of the Bond and Singer analyses tend to rule out the possibility that the program had a favorable influence on an increase. A significant improvement in mean scores suggests there was a positive educational improvement; however one is unable to identify its cause. In this category were the following group/subject areas:

Seventh Grade English Dominant Students

English as a dominant language math

Seventh Grade Spanish Dominant Students

Spanish as a dominant language reading
English as a second language reading
English as a second language math

Eighth Grade English Dominant Students

English as a dominant language math

One can be moderately confident that the areas of improvement noted above do represent positive educational improvements. The negative findings of the Bond and Singer analyses rule out the program as the agent in these improvements and no other causes can be identified for them.

The evaluators' pretest-posttest analyses of math in the dominant language (Spanish) found that the seventh and eighth grade Spanish dominant student made no significant improvements. These analyses were judged to be ineffective and were discarded. However, percentile norms for the Spanish math test indicated that the seventh grade was performing at a low level but the eighth grade at a quite high level at the end of the year. On this basis the evaluators judged the eighth grade Spanish math objective to be successfully completed but not the objective for the seventh grade.

With regard to the four objectives treating student attitude or achievement motivation, the evaluators judged the seventh grade Spanish dominant students' objective to be successfully attained. The eighth grade English dominant students had highly favorable results on this objective but the number of students tested did not permit one to draw any firm conclusion. The seventh grade English dominant students appeared to have failed on this objective; perhaps their negative performance here has a meaningful relationship to their instances of academic failures.

The program's staff development and training this year was judged to be very successful. The Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory was not used this year as a test (it was used as a training device). However, based on past experience with this instrument at the School, the evaluators believe that "teacher attitude" is an important area which should be treated in the program's staff development activities in subsequent years.

The evaluators conclude that the program has been quite successful overall in achieving its objectives this year. Obviously the English and Spanish dominant seventh graders present the program with a strong educational challenge. The program still has an additional year to work its magic on them and advance their education. The eighth graders, both English and Spanish dominant, generally performed very successfully this year.

The evaluators reiterate their favorable assessment of the program this year because it often seemed in this evaluation report that what was being treated was not so good a program. This is the

case because the evaluation studies of the bilingual education program at the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School, through the efforts of both project directors and evaluators, have over the years become progressively more rigorous in evaluation design. Thus, the program has been put to harder and harder tests of performance.

Recommendations

The evaluators again strongly recommend that this effective, well-tested model bilingual education program be refunded under ESEA Title VII. In order to enhance and strengthen the program during its subsequent years of operation, the evaluators offer the program and District staff the following recommendations and suggestions:

1. Carefully review and then possibly reorganize instruction in the program in those areas where the evaluation found students to be making little or no improvement in academic growth (these areas are identified in the previous subsection of this report).

2. Include in staff development and training activities, workshops, training sessions, presentations, etc. that deal with teacher and staff attitudes, particularly those attitudes relevant to bilingual-bicultural education, e.g., roughly the content that is dealt with on the Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory.

3. Include in the evaluation design for next year a significant educational process (formative) component. The generally poor performance of the seventh graders indicates there is a strong need for such evaluation.

4. Increase the number of workshops in the academic areas of math, science and social studies, as some teachers have suggested. Teacher ratings of the program's instructional areas indicated that these three areas were something of a problem.

5. Provide time for regular, perhaps weekly staff meetings and conferences, as some teachers have suggested.

6. Provide teachers more individual contact with the teacher trainer, as some teachers have suggested.

7. In order to provide additional, useful diagnostic information on students and their achievement motivation, consider administering the Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students near the beginning of the school year. The Scale now can be easily scored and the percentile norms which have been developed for it can provide for the interpretation of scores.

8. Unless a good replacement can be obtained for the Prueba de Aprovechamiento en Matemáticas, the objectives for math in the dominant language (Spanish) should be abandoned.

9. The District and other school authorities should see to it that the bilingual program at the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School has adequate space and facilities. The dramatic growth of the program in terms of students, instructional staff and administrative staff clearly seems to necessitate providing the program more space at its present location or more spacious facilities elsewhere.

10. Include in the evaluation design for next year a significant management process component. It appears to the evaluators that the great increase in the size of the program -- both in terms of students and staff -- has created a need for a fuller examination and perhaps a re-organization of all aspects of program management and administration.

ATTITUDE SCALE FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS

Instruction Booklet

READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS TO THE STUDENTS:

"This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not put your name on your answer sheet. This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to say how you feel about your school -- the Rafael Cordero Bilingual School -- and how you feel about things like studying, being a teenager and your future."

"Fill in the blanks at the top of your answer sheet with your GRADE, AGE, SEX (put F for female and M for male), CLASS (your official class), GROUP (your English-social studies group) and PRINCIPAL HOME LANGUAGE or the language used most in your home (put S for Spanish and E for English). And as I said, do not put your name on your answer sheet."

"I will read a sentence and then four possible ways to complete it. The four choices are written on your answer sheet. Listen while I read each sentence and follow on your answer sheet as I read the four answers. Mark with an X the block before the answer that best describes how you really feel. Mark only one answer. Try to mark your answer quickly without thinking too much about it. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers."

"Let's do the example. For practice let's all mark the block for 'Sort of fat.' Listen."

"I like to read books that are... A. Very fat B. Sort of fat C. Sort of thin D. Very thin."

CHECK TO SEE THAT ALL STUDENTS HAVE MARKED BLOCK B FOR "Sort of fat," AND PROCEED.

1. I go to school mainly to...
   - A. See my friends
   - B. Have a good time
   - C. Please my parents
   - D. Get a good education

2. If someone told me what my class next year would be like I would be...
   - A. Very interested
   - B. Sort of interested
   - C. Only a little interested
   - D. Not interested at all

3. I think about finishing high school...
   - A. Very often
   - B. Sometimes
   - C. Rarely
   - D. Never

4. I feel that most teachers like me...
   - A. Very much
   - B. A lot
   - C. A little
   - D. Not at all

5. I like to take trips to new places...
   - A. Very much
   - B. A lot
   - C. A little
   - D. Not at all

6. The books used in our school are...
   - A. Too difficult
   - B. Sort of difficult
   - C. Sort of easy
   - D. Too easy

7. I feel that being bilingual will help me when I grow up...
   - A. Very much
   - B. A lot
   - C. Some
   - D. It doesn't matter

8. I like to tell my family and friends about what I am learning in school...
   - A. Always
   - B. Often
   - C. Sometimes
   - D. Rarely or never

9. When I stay home from school I usually feel...
   - A. Very happy
   - B. Sort of happy
   - C. Sort of sad
   - D. Very sad

CONTINUED ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE

10. I like for the teacher to call on me in class...
   A. Very often
   B. Sometimes
   C. Rarely
   D. Not at all

11. If I heard my parents talking about the kind of job that I might have some day, I would be...
   A. Very interested
   B. Sort of interested
   C. Only a little interested
   D. Not interested at all

12. If my friends made fun of me for using big words, I would feel...
   A. Very embarrassed
   B. Sort of uncomfortable
   C. Sort of mad
   D. It wouldn't matter

13. I try to come to school on time...
   A. Always
   B. Most of the time
   C. Some of the time
   D. Never

14. If I discussed a newspaper story with my teacher, I would feel...
   A. Very good
   B. Sort of good
   C. Only a little good
   D. It wouldn't matter

15. I like to talk to people who have accomplished great things...
   A. Very much
   B. A lot
   C. A little
   D. Not at all

16. I like to help my friends with their schoolwork...
   A. A lot
   B. Sometimes
   C. Not much
   D. Never

17. If I could make my teacher very happy by solving a math problem I would want to...
   A. Try very hard
   B. Try sort of hard
   C. It wouldn't matter
   D. Try to get it wrong

18. When I finish high school I would like to...
   A. Take it easy
   B. Get married
   C. Get a good job
   D. Go to college

19. If I read my parents a story I had written for them, I would feel...
   A. Very proud
   B. Sort of proud
   C. A little proud
   D. It wouldn't matter

20. When it's hard to understand a new idea, I want to...
   A. Try harder
   B. Ask for help
   C. Do something else
   D. Give up

21. When I have a big assignment I want to...
   A. Finish it as soon as possible
   B. Work on it when I can
   C. Finish it at the last minute
   D. Turn it in late

22. When I watch a television program I try to think what I would do if I were the main character...
   A. Always
   B. Often
   C. Rarely
   D. Never

23. When I don't know how to spell a word, I...
   A. Use another word
   B. Guess
   C. Ask someone
   D. Look in a dictionary

24. I believe that there are some things that I'm better off <u>not</u> knowing...
   A. Strongly agree
   B. Agree
   C. Disagree
   D. Strongly disagree

25. To answer this question you must fill in the blank in the following sentence:

   When I grow up I want to be a _____

ANSWER SHEET

GRADE_____ AGE_____ SEX_____ CLASS_____ GROUP_____ PRINCIPAL HOME LANGUAGE_____

EXAMPLE:
- ☐ A. Very fat
- ☐ B. Sort of fat
- ☐ C. Sort of thin
- ☐ D. Very thin

1. ☐ A. See my friends
   ☐ B. Have a good time
   ☐ C. Please my parents
   ☐ D. Get a good education

2. ☐ A. Very interested
   ☐ B. Sort of interested
   ☐ C. Only a little interested
   ☐ D. Not interested at all

3. ☐ A. Very often
   ☐ B. Sometimes
   ☐ C. Rarely
   ☐ D. Never

4. ☐ A. Very much
   ☐ B. A lot
   ☐ C. A little
   ☐ D. Not at all

5. ☐ A. Very much
   ☐ B. A lot
   ☐ C. A little
   ☐ D. Not at all

6. ☐ A. Too difficult
   ☐ B. Sort of difficult
   ☐ C. Sort of easy
   ☐ D. Too easy

7. ☐ A. Very much
   ☐ B. A lot
   ☐ C. Some
   ☐ D. It doesn't matter

8. ☐ A. Always
   ☐ B. Often
   ☐ C. Sometimes
   ☐ D. Rarely or never

9. ☐ A. Very happy
   ☐ B. Sort of happy
   ☐ C. Sort of sad
   ☐ D. Very sad

10. ☐ A. Very often
    ☐ B. Sometimes
    ☐ C. Rarely
    ☐ D. Not at all

11. ☐ A. Very interested
    ☐ B. Sort of interested
    ☐ C. Only a little interested
    ☐ D. Not interested at all

12. ☐ A. Very embarrassed
    ☐ B. Sort of uncomfortable
    ☐ C. Sort of mad
    ☐ D. It wouldn't matter

13. ☐ A. Always
    ☐ B. Most of the time
    ☐ C. Some of the time
    ☐ D. Never

14. ☐ A. Very good
    ☐ B. Sort of good
    ☐ C. Only a little good
    ☐ D. It wouldn't matter

15. ☐ A. Very much
    ☐ B. A lot
    ☐ C. A little
    ☐ D. Not at all

16. ☐ A. A lot
    ☐ B. Sometimes
    ☐ C. Not much
    ☐ D. Never

17. ☐ A. Try very hard
    ☐ B. Try sort of hard
    ☐ C. It wouldn't matter
    ☐ D. Try to get it wrong

18. ☐ A. Take it easy
    ☐ B. Get married
    ☐ C. Get a good job
    ☐ D. Go to college

19. ☐ A. Very proud
    ☐ B. Sort of proud
    ☐ C. A little proud
    ☐ D. It wouldn't matter

20. ☐ A. Try harder
    ☐ B. Ask for help
    ☐ C. Do something else
    ☐ D. Give up

21. ☐ A. Finish it as soon as possible
    ☐ B. Work on it when I can
    ☐ C. Finish it at the last minute
    ☐ D. Turn it in late

22. ☐ A. Always
    ☐ B. Often
    ☐ C. Rarely
    ☐ D. Never

23. ☐ A. Use another word
    ☐ B. Guess
    ☐ C. Ask someone
    ☐ D. Look in a dictionary

24. ☐ A. Strongly agree
    ☐ B. Agree
    ☐ C. Disagree
    ☐ D. Strongly disagree

25. When I grow up I want to be a _____

_____

PERCENTILE NORMS FOR ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION
Attitude Scale for Bilingual Students
English and Spanish Versions
Seventh and Eighth Grade Students

RAW SCORE	PERCENTILE SCORE		
	E-Norms[1]	S-Norms[2]	M-Norms[3]
71	99	--	--
70	97	--	99
69	96	--	98
68	88	96	98
67	86	96	97
66	85	95	97
65	82	94	92
64	76	92	89
63	70	90	86
62	65	86	84
61	64	80	79
60	58	75	76
59	55	60	71
58	47	56	62
57	42	48	59
56	39	35	52
55	35	33	46
54	28	25	44
53	26	21	40
52	21	15	30
51	17	8	27
50	14	8	21
49	12	7	19
48	10	6	16
47	8	4	14
46	7	2	13
45	6	2	12
44	5	2	10
43	4	1	8
42	3	1	8
41	3	0	7
40	2	--	6
39	1	--	5
38	0	--	3
37	--	--	3
36	--	--	3
35	--	--	2
34	--	--	2
...			
25	--	--	1
...			
15	--	--	0

[1]E-Norms were based on the administration of the English Version to English-dominant 7th and 8th graders, June 1977 (N = 55, M = 57.4, SD = 7.7).

[2]S-Norms were based on the administration of the Spanish Version to Spanish-dominant 7th and 8th graders, June 1977 (N = 48, M = 56.7, SD = 5.4).

[3]M-Norms were based on the administration the English or Spanish Versions to 7th and 8th graders of "mixed" dominance, the so-called "Aspira students," June 1977 (N = 100, M = 53.9, SD = 8.6).

APPENDIX C

PROCEDURES FOR SCORING ATTITUDE SCALE FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS

ATTITUDE SCALE FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS

GRADE_____ AGE_____ SEX_____ CLASS_____ GROUP_____ PRINCIPAL HOME LANGUAGE_____

EXAMPLE:
- ☐ A. Very fat
- ☐ B. Sort of fat
- ☐ C. Sort of thin
- ☐ D. Very thin

1. 0 A. See my friends
   0 B. Have a good time
   1 C. Please my parents
   4 D. Get a good education

2. 3 A. Very interested
   2 B. Sort of interested
   1 C. Only a little interested
   0 D. Not interested at all

3. 3 A. Very often
   2 B. Sometimes
   1 C. Rarely
   0 D. Never

4. 3 A. Very much
   2 B. A lot
   1 C. A little
   0 D. Not at all

5. 2 A. Very much
   1 B. A lot
   1 C. A little
   0 D. Not at all

6. 1 A. Too difficult
   1 B. Sort of difficult
   1 C. Sort of easy
   0 D. Too easy

7. 3 A. Very much
   2 B. A lot
   1 C. Some
   0 D. It doesn't matter

8. 2 A. Always
   2 B. Often
   3 C. Sometimes
   1 D. Rarely or never

9. 0 A. Very happy
   0 B. Sort of happy
   1 C. Sort of sad
   2 D. Very sad

10. 3 A. Very often
    2 B. Sometimes
    1 C. Rarely
    0 D. Not at all

11. 4 A. Very interested
    2 B. Sort of interested
    1 C. Only a little interested
    0 D. Not interested at all

12. 1 A. Very embarrassed
    1 B. Sort of uncomfortable
    2 C. Sort of mad
    3 D. It wouldn't matter

13. 4 A. Always
    2 B. Most of the time
    1 C. Some of the time
    0 D. Never

14. 3 A. Very good
    2 B. Sort of good
    1 C. Only a little good
    0 D. It wouldn't matter

15. 4 A. Very much
    3 B. A lot
    2 C. A little
    0 D. Not at all

16. 2 A. A lot
    1 B. Sometimes
    0 C. Not much
    0 D. Never

17. 3 A. Try very hard
    2 B. Try sort of hard
    1 C. It wouldn't matter
    0 D. Try to get it wrong

18. 0 A. Take it easy
    1 B. Get married
    3 C. Get a good job
    4 D. Go to college

19. 3 A. Very proud
    2 B. Sort of proud
    1 C. A little proud
    0 D. It wouldn't matter

20. 3 A. Try harder
    2 B. Ask for help
    1 C. Do something else
    0 D. Give up

21. 3 A. Finish it as soon as possible
    1 B. Work on it when I can
    1 C. Finish it at the last minute
    0 D. Turn it in late

22. 2 A. Always
    1 B. Often
    0 C. Rarely
    0 D. Never

23. 1 A. Use another word
    1 B. Guess
    2 C. Ask someone
    3 D. Look in a dictionary

24. 1 A. Strongly agree
    1 B. Agree
    2 C. Disagree
    3 D. Strongly disagree

25. When I grow up I want to be

TOTAL SCORE

SCALE FOR SCORING ITEM NO. 25

ATTITUDE SCALE FOR BILINGUAL STUDENTS

Ranking of Occupations

Question No. 25: "When I grow up I want to be a _____?"

Rating	General Description	Subcategories and Examples
5	Highest Professional and Proprietary	Select Professionals: medical doctor, lawyer, scientist, university professor Proprietors of large businesses, executives and managers in large corporations High level public officials: president, governor, mayor, congressman, cabinet member, supreme court judge, etc.
4	Middle Professional and Proprietary	All professionals not included in 5 and not appropriate for 3: Teacher, policeman, pilot, detective, Architect, Dentist, Optomotrist, Fireman, Comissioned Officer, Engineer, Accountant, Veternarian, Journalist, Writer, News Reporter, account executive, etc. Proprietors of medium-sized businesses, executives, managers, labor union leaders Middle level public officials: city councilmen, assemblemen, police commissioner
3	Don't Know, etc.	
3	Clerical and Kindred Workers; Office Workers; "White-collared" Middle Class Occupations; and Small businessmen	Secretary, bank teller, assistant account executive, administrative assistant, etc. Low level public officials Proprietors of small businesses: grocery store owner, owner of funeral parlor, farmer, etc.
2	Skilled, Technical Workers/Craftsman	Aviation mechanic, draftsman, nurse, private dectective, non-commissioned military personnel, model, photographer, baseball player and other "stars," actress, undertaker, etc.
1	Semi-skilled and other Laborers	Taxi driver, auto mechanic, garbage man, housewife, beautician, clerk, typist, etc.
0	Frivolous Occupations	E.g., junkie, mujeriego, etc.

Edward J. Cervenka/S.B. Cervenka
Evaluators

RAFAEL CORDERO BILINGUAL SCHOOL
NYC COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT 4

PARTICIPANT EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES
PROVIDED UNDER E.S.E.A. TITLE VII (i.e., the BETTER Personnel Program)

Code: f = frequency or number responding; % = percent responding; $\bar{x}$ = Mean Rating

1. What is your position? (Check one)

f	%	N = 16
14	88	Teacher
		Paraprofessional
1	6	Educational Assistant
		Aide
1	6	Administrative Staff

2. How much, if any, staff development and training activity provided under E.S.E.A. Title VII did you participate in during the summer of 1977 in preparation for instruction this school year?

f	%	N = 14
8	57	None (If none, skip 3 and go to Question 4)
1	7	1-2 days
1	7	3-4 days
		5-10 days (1-2 weeks)
		11-15 days (2-3 weeks)
2	14	16-20 days (3-4 weeks)
1	7	More than 4 weeks
1	7	NR (No Response)

3. How useful has the summer training proved to be to you in your work during this school year?

f	%	N = 5
3	60	Very useful
2	40	Quite useful
		Moderately useful
		Marginally useful
		Somewhat useless
		Very useless

4. How many days of pre-service staff development and training activity provided under E.S.E.A. Title VII did you participate in immediately before school began?

f	%	N = 14
8	57	None (If none, skip 5 and go to Question 6)
		1 day
		2 days
3	21	3 days
1	7	4-5 days
		6 days or more
2	14	NR (No Response)

5. How useful has the pre-service staff development and training proved to be to you in your work during the school year?

f	%	N = 5
3	60	Very useful
2	40	Quite useful
		Moderately useful
		Marginally useful
		Somewhat useless
		Very useless

6. How frequently did you participate in scheduled in-service training and staff development activities or sessions provided under E.S.E.A. Title VII during the school year?

N = 14

N.B.: Exclude "Special Workshops."

(Cont. in next column)

(Question 6 cont. from preceding column)

f	%	
1	7	None (If none, skip 7 and go to Question 8)
1	7	Twice or more per week
6	43	Weekly
1	7	Semimonthly (twice a month)
		Monthly
2	14	Bimonthly (once every two months)
1	7	Once a term
1	7	Once during the school year
1	7	Other: "Workshops"

7. How useful has the in-service training proved to be to you in your work during this school year?

f	%	N = 14
4	29	Very useful
4	29	Quite useful
3	21	Moderately useful
1	7	Marginally useful
		Somewhat useless
		Very useless
2	14	NR (No Response)

8. List the university courses provided under E.S.E.A. Title VII that you took during FY 1977-78.

f	%	N = 14
6	43	None (If none, skip 9 and go to 10)
8	57	Took a total of 14 courses

Principal courses: Theory and Practice of Bilingual Education (5); Problems of Education in Metropolitan Areas - Bilingual Education (2); Multi-Media Systems in Education (2); Content Research in Bilingual Education (2); Introduction to General Linguistics (1); Contrastive Linguistics (1); Languages and Cultures of the Caribbean (1); Culture and Communication (1), etc.

9. How relevant were these courses to you and your work generally this year?

f	%	N = 8
3	38	Very relevant
4	50	Quite relevant
		Moderately relevant
		Marginally relevant
		Somewhat irrelevant
		Very irrelevant
1	12	NR (No Response)

10. How many Special Workshops (Weekend or otherwise) did you participate in during the school year? List Special Workshops in which you participated.

f	%		Question 11 Rating	
1	7	None		
13	93	Attended 20 different Special Workshops and Conferences, e.g.	f	%
		Harrison House Workshop	5	4.5
		Adria House Workshop	5	4.6
		Workshop for Gifted Children	4	4.0
		Teacher In-Service Workshop	3	3.3
		Warwick Hotel Conference	2	4.0
		And 15 other Special Workshops and Conferences	19	4.1
		Overall Rating = 38		4.1

11. In the blanks provided on the right side of Question 10 (preceeding page), rate each of the Special Workshops you participated in, in terms of their contribution to your job performance and professional development, using the following scale:

5 = Very Great Contribution
4 = Substantial Contribution
3 = Moderate Contribution
2 = Slight Contribution
1 = No Contribution

12. How effective were the Special Workshops in terms of implementation, i.e., organization, schedule, administration, etc.

N = 13

f	%	
7	54	Very effective
5	39	Quite effective
		Moderately effective
1	8	Marginally effective
		Somewhat ineffective
		Very ineffective

13. How useful have the Special Workshops proved to be to you generally in your work this year?

N = 13

f	%	
5	39	Very useful
5	39	Quite useful
2	15	Moderately useful
		Marginally useful
		Somewhat useless
		Very useless
1	8	NR (No Response

14. Considering all staff development and training activities provided under E.S.E.A. Title VII during the year, indicate (check blanks on left) the areas of professional preparation treated and rate treatment in each of these areas using the following scale:

5 = Excellent
4 = Good
3 = Satisfactory
2 = Poor
1 = Seriously inadequate

N = 14

Areas Treated during 1977-78 (Q. 14)	Rating (Q.14) f	Rating (Q.14) x̄	Future Need (Q.15) f	Future Need (Q.15) x̄
Personal qualities leading to successful teaching in Bilingual Education programs	8	4.1	8	4.4
Increasing language proficiency in English or Spanish	8	3.6	6	2.7
Linguistics, psycholinguistics	9	3.7	7	3.4
The concept of culture	7	3.6	5	3.4
Specific cultural heritages	9	3.8	6	3.8
Instructional methods, techniques, etc.	10	4.0	7	3.9
Utilization of auxiliary personnel	9	3.8	7	3.9
Instruction in subject areas	9	3.4	8	4.2
Curriculum development, adaptation and utilization	11	3.9	7	4.3
Student assessment, including preparation of behavioral objectives	6	3.7	7	4.3
Guidance and counseling	11	4.2	7	4.1

(Question 14 cont. from preceeding column)

Areas Treated (Q. 14)	Rating (Q.14) f	Rating (Q.14) x̄	Future Need (Q.15) f	Future Need (Q.15) x̄
Instruction for bilingual children with learning disabilities	7	4.3	8	3.8
School-community relations and parent involvement	8	4.3	7	4.3
Supervision and administration as a professional area	8	3.5	8	3.5
Supervision of your own teaching or other activities	12	3.9	8	4.4
Types and methodology of staff development employed by School	8	3.9	8	4.4

15. Refer back to spaces for "Future Need" at the right of Question 14 and indicate your own needs for staff development and training for the next school year, 1978-79, using the following scale of needs assessment:

5 = Very Great
4 = Substantial
3 = Moderate
2 = Slight
1 = No need

16. Indicate in which subject areas of instruction you feel a need for professional preparation for bilingual education. Use the scale in Question 15 above.

f	x̄	
8	3.4	English as a Second Language
6	3.8	Spanish as a Second Language
8	3.1	English language arts
6	3.0	Spanish language arts
8	4.0	Social studies
6	4.3	Math
6	3.8	Science
10	4.2	Career Awareness Instruction (I-CAN)
		Bilingual Education Through the
6	4.2	Arts (BETA)
9	3.4	Bilingual Guidance Program
		Other

17. Additional comments on this year's staff development and training activities (use back of sheet if necessary):

See text of report.

18. Recommendations for next year's staff development and training activities (use back of sheet if necessary):

See text of report

APPENDIX E. BILINGUAL TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY (SAMPLE ITEMS)

BILINGUAL TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

Experimental Version

Developed under ESEA Title VII Funding
by Edward J. Cervenka, S. B. Cervenka and Awilda Orta

New York City Community School District 4
Bilingual Program

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of 125 statements designed to sample opinion about bilingual education, specifically opinion about teacher-student relationships, language and bilingualism, culture and cultural heritages, educational theory and practices, and school-parent relations. There is considerable disagreement concerning what bilingual education should be; therefore, there are no right or wrong answers on this inventory. What is wanted here is your own individual feeling about each of these statements. Read each statement and decide how YOU feel about it. Then mark your answer on the space provided on the answer sheet.

If you STRONGLY AGREE, blacken space under "A"

If you AGREE, blacken space under "B"

If you are UNDECIDED or UNCERTAIN, blacken space under "C"

If you DISAGREE, blacken space under "D"

If you STRONGLY DISAGREE, blacken space under "E"

Try to think in terms of the general situation rather than specific ones. There is no time limit, but work as rapidly as you can. As soon as you read and understand a statement, mark your answer based on your first intuitive reaction. Please try to respond to every item.

BILINGUAL TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY (SAMPLE ITEMS)

The Bilingual Teacher Attitude Inventory, which is currently being used on a district-wide basis in NYC CSD 4, is being maintained as a secure instrument and therefore it cannot be reproduced in its entirety. The following is an illustrative sample of items from the inventory:

1. "Friendly teachers cannot control their class."
2. "The United States has one standard dialect of English."
3. "A teacher, like any other professional, should not be expected to confer with students or parents outside of working hours."
4. "In teaching the spelling of Spanish words such as cazar and casar, one should introduce the Castilian pronunciation for emphasis."
5. "People who don't look you in the eye when talking cannot be trusted."
6. "People who live for many years in the United States without learning English are showing that they do not really like the country."
7. "In Hispanic societies, shame and authority are characteristic means of social control."